

FERTILIZER DRAWN HOLLOW FIBER FORWARD OSMOSIS FOR DESALINATION

Submitted by

TAHIR MAJEED

**A thesis submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy**



**University of Technology Sydney
FACULTY OF ENGINEERING**


AUGUST 2014

Certificate of Authorship

I certify that the work in this thesis has not previously been submitted for a degree nor has it been submitted as part of requirements for a degree except as fully acknowledged within the text.

I also certify that the thesis has been written by me. Any help that I have received in my research work and the preparation of the thesis itself has been acknowledged. In addition, I certify that all information sources and literature used are indicated in the thesis.

Tahir Majeed

Signature of Student: 

Date: 20-08-2014

**DEDICATED TO ALL THOSE WHO SPENT THEIR LIFE FOR THE
WELFARE OF THE HUMANITY**

Acknowledgement

I would like to express my deepest gratitude to my parents Prof. Dr. Abdul Majeed (Abbu) and Hameedah Majeed (Ammi) who have been such an inspiration to me in every sense over the course of my tertiary studies. Although I was away from them, their continuous love, support, and guidance gave me the strength and confidence to complete my PhD thesis within the allotted time frame. My dear parents, you mean so much to me because you have unfailingly nurtured my learning and supported my dreams!

I would like to take this opportunity to express my sincere gratitude to my supervisor Dr. Ho Kyong Shon for giving me the opportunity to work with him. I will always remember his unswerving encouragement, great mentorship, and support throughout my doctoral candidature. Without his consistent guidance and help, this work would not have been possible.

I wish to extend my thanks to my co-supervisor Dr. Sherub Phuntsho who fully supported me in my studies from the beginning to the end and guided me as a true friend.

I would also like to express my appreciation to the other SCEE faculty members Prof. Saravanamuth Vigneswaran, Dr. Hu Hao Ngo, Dr. Christian Kazner, A/Prof. Jaya Khandaswamy and Dr. Robert McLaughlan for their continuous encouragement during my PhD studies.

Further, I acknowledge Mohammad Johir, David Hopper and Rami Hadad for their support in terms of the project's laboratory work and equipment set up. I also acknowledge the excellent administrative support received from Phyllis Agius, Craig Knowles, Tim Kevin, and Van Lee during this period.

I would like to express my sincere thanks to Samsung Samsung Cheil Industries Inc., Korea for providing me with the hollow fiber forward osmosis membranes for my studies. I would

like to thank the National Centre for Excellence in Desalination Australia funded by the Australian Government through the Water for the Future Initiative for providing me with the funding to make this project and thesis possible. This work would also not have been possible without the institutional, experimental and scholarship support from the University of Technology, Sydney.

Special thanks to my FO group mates Soleyman Sahebi, Fouzy Lotfi, Jung Eun Kim who continuously supported me in all phases of my lab research work.

I am also grateful to all of the university research fellows such as Dr. Ibrahim El Salibiy, Dr. Ghausul Hussain, Dr. Tien Thanh, Mohammad Shahzad, Muhammad Shahid, Laura Chakli and Aaron Katz for their valuable support and guidance over my PhD candidature.

It is a pleasure to thank everybody who supported me directly or indirectly over the period of my doctoral studies.

Last but not the least; I would like to thank my loving and devoted wife Tehsin. My work would not have been possible without her patience and commitment. She gave me tremendous support over the entire duration of my PhD studies and really deserves the utmost thanks for all of the sacrifices that she made in relation to supporting my research. Additionally, I would like to thank my extraordinarily gifted and loving children Hasan and Ahsan who not simply shared my routine activities and responsibilities over this important period of my life but also helped in every way they could to ease the burden of my studies.

Table of Contents

Certificate of Authorship	ii
Acknowledgement	iv
Abstract.....	xi
Journal Articles Published	xv
Conference papers and presentations	xvi
Nomenclature.....	xix
List of Symbols.....	xxi
List of Figures.....	xxiii
List of Tables	xxx
Chapter 1	1-1
INTRODUCTION	1-1
1.1 Background	1-2
1.2 Research Motivation	1-6
1.3 Objectives and Scope of the Study	1-8
1.4 Structure outline of the thesis	1-9
Chapter 2	2-1
LITERATURE REVIEW	2-1
2.1 Introduction.....	2-2
2.1.1 Water and our world	2-2
2.1.2 Water use	2-3
2.1.3 Water salinity - the biggest challenge.....	2-3
2.2 Desalination- an outline	2-4
2.3 Classification of desalination technologies.....	2-6
2.3.1 Thermal desalination processes	2-7

2.3.2	Membrane-based desalination processes.....	2-8
2.3.3	Hybrid desalination processes/ Hybrid systems using distillation and membrane technology	2-9
2.4	Choice of desalination technologies	2-10
2.4.1	Total cost of the desalination process.....	2-10
2.4.2	Operating cost of desalination	2-11
2.4.3	Water desalination cost and its relevance to type of feed water.....	2-11
2.4.4	Desalination Economics	2-15
2.4.5	Hybrid desalination systems.....	2-15
2.4.6	Renewable energy source powered desalination	2-16
2.5	Common membrane technologies	2-17
2.5.1	Classification of membranes	2-18
2.5.2	Reverse osmosis (RO)	2-18
2.5.3	Brackish Water RO.....	2-21
2.5.4	Nano filtration	2-21
2.5.5	Electrodialysis /Electrodialysis Reversal	2-22
2.5.6	Capacitive Deionisation.....	2-23
2.5.7	Membrane distillation.....	2-24
2.5.8	Ultra filtration/micro filtration.....	2-25
2.6	Physical appearance of the membranes and modules	2-25
2.7	Forward osmosis - A unique concept development and future trends.....	2-26
2.7.1	Differences in RO and FO	2-27

2.7.2	Brief History	2-29
2.7.3	Potential advantages of the FO process over current desalination technologies	2-31
2.7.4	Common concerns with FO	2-31
2.7.5	Potential FO applications and future trends	2-32
2.8	Forward Osmosis – Theory	2-33
2.8.1	Osmotic pressure- The main natural driving force behind FO	2-33
2.8.2	Water flux model	2-34
2.8.3	Concentration polarization	2-35
2.8.4	Estimation of Water Flux	2-40
2.8.5	Reverse Solute Flux	2-41
2.8.6	Pressure retarded osmosis	2-42
2.9	Main components of a FO process	2-42
2.9.1	Forward osmosis membranes	2-42
2.9.2	Development of FO membranes and their progress	2-43
2.9.3	Draw solution	2-48
2.9.4	Feed solution	2-52
2.9.5	Permeate recovery	2-56
2.9.6	Module configuration	2-58
2.10	Important issues and challenges in FO	2-59
2.10.1	Draw solution	2-59
2.10.2	Treatment of the diluted draw solution	2-60

2.10.3	Reverse solute flux	2-64
2.10.4	Lower flux due to concentration polarization.....	2-64
2.10.5	Performance ratio	2-66
2.10.6	FO membrane fouling.....	2-66
2.11	Membrane cleaning	2-71
2.12	Effect of operating parameters	2-72
2.13	Fertilizer drawn forward osmosis (FDFO) process.....	2-73
2.13.1	Prospects for the FDFO process	2-73
2.13.2	Issues with the FDFO process	2-74
2.14	Concluding remarks	2-75
Chapter 3		3-1
MATERIALS AND METHODS		3-1
3.1	Introduction.....	3-2
3.2	Chemicals used in the study.....	3-2
3.2.1	Feed solutions	3-2
3.2.2	Draw solutions.....	3-4
3.2.3	Organic foulants	3-6
3.2.4	Cleaning Chemicals.....	3-7
3.3	Forward osmosis membranes.....	3-7
3.4	Evaluation of the membrane properties	3-8
3.4.1	Pure water permeability.....	3-8
3.4.2	Salt rejection	3-9

3.5	Experimental FO system set-up and configuration.....	3-10
3.5.1	Laboratory-scale FO system.....	3-10
3.5.2	Flat sheet FO cell.....	3-11
3.5.3	Hollow fibre FO module	3-11
3.5.4	Experimental conditions	3-11
3.6	Measurement and analysis	3-12
3.6.1	FO performance.....	3-12
3.6.2	SEM observation	3-14
3.6.3	Contact angle tests	3-16
Chapter 4	4-1
4.1	Introduction.....	4-2
4.2	Experimental.....	4-6
4.2.1	FO Set-up.....	4-6
4.2.2	Performance and measurements	4-8
4.3	Results & discussions	4-9
4.3.1	Selection of suitable fertilizers as DS.....	4-9
4.3.2	Characteristics of fertilizer DS and their effects on osmotic pressure and FO flux	4-14
4.3.3	Flux variation patterns with changing FS concentration	4-18
4.3.4	Behavior of the Individual fertilizers DS on RSF	4-20
4.3.5	Fouling behavior of FO membrane with commercial fertilizer DS.....	4-22
4.3.6	Application of final diluted draw solution.....	4-22

4.4	Concluding remarks	4-24
Chapter 5		
5.1	Introduction.....	5-1
5.2	Materials and methods	5-2
5.2.1	Forward osmosis performance measurements.....	5-4
5.2.2	Chemicals and reagents	5-4
5.2.3	Performance and measurements	5-5
5.3	Results and discussion	5-5
5.3.1	Screening of fertilizers to prepare DS	5-5
5.3.2	Preparation of mixed fertilizer DS suitable for tomato application	5-7
5.3.3	Water flux in FO process using mixed fertilizer draw solutes	5-8
5.3.4	Comparison of flux for changing N-source fertilizer during various plant growth stages	5-13
5.3.5	Reverse solute flux using DS blend.....	5-16
5.3.6	Long-term run tests for fertilizer DS and expected final DS concentration	5-21
5.3.7	Dilution of final diluted DS	5-24
5.4	Concluding remarks	5-24
Chapter 6		
PERFORMANCES OF THE PA HOLLOW FIBER AND CTA FLAT SHEET MEMBRANE FOR THE FORWARD OSMOSIS PROCESS		
6.1	Introduction.....	6-1
6.2	Experimental.....	6-5

6.2.1	Experimental Set-up	6-5
6.2.2	Membranes used	6-6
6.2.3	Chemicals and reagents	6-6
6.2.4	FO operating setup summary	6-7
6.3	Results & discussion	6-7
6.3.1	HFFO and FSFO membranes comparison	6-7
6.3.2	Comparative performances of FO membranes in terms of water flux and reverse solute flux	6-10
6.3.3	Overall flux evaluation and comparison	6-10
6.3.4	Reverse solute flux (RSF) evaluation and comparison	6-13
6.3.5	Flux and RSF behavior with hydrated radii	6-15
6.4	Concluding remarks	6-20
Chapter 7	7-1
INFLUENCE OF THE PROCESS PARAMETERS ON HOLLOW FIBER FORWARD OSMOSIS MEMBRANE PERFORMANCES		7-1
7.1	Introduction	7-2
7.2	Experimental	7-5
7.3	Results and discussion	7-7
7.3.1	Effect of crossflow direction on FO performance	7-7
7.3.2	Effect of membrane orientation on FO performance	7-8
7.3.3	Effect of membrane orientation on reverse solute flux	7-10
7.3.4	Performance of HFFO membrane in terms of specific reverse solute flux (SRSF)	7-12

7.3.5	Effect of DS type on FO performance.....	7-14
7.3.6	Effect of crossflow rate on the HFFO performance	7-15
7.3.7	Combined effects of process conditions.....	7-22
7.4	Concluding remarks	7-22
Chapter 8		8-1
COMBINED EFFECTS OF SCALING AND FOULING FOR HOLLOW FIBER FORWARD OSMOSIS MEMBRANE.....		
8.1	Introduction.....	8-2
8.2	Experimental.....	8-5
8.2.1	FO setup.....	8-5
8.2.2	Membrane used	8-7
8.2.3	Chemicals used	8-7
8.2.4	Measurement of water flux.....	8-9
8.2.5	Performance checks and physical cleaning of the FO membranes	8-9
8.3	Results and discussion	8-10
8.3.1	Scaling potential of FO membrane in AL-FS orientation	8-10
8.3.2	Scaling potential of FO membrane in AL-DS orientation.....	8-11
8.3.3	Flux changes with FS concentration.....	8-12
8.3.4	Effect of organic foulants on FO flux performances in AL-FS orientation	8-13
8.3.5	Effects of organic foulants on FO flux performances in AL-DS orientation	8-16

8.3.6	Evaluation of FO scaling and fouling using a distinct alternative approach.....	8-22
8.3.7	Actual effects of inorganic fouling on FO performance.....	8-24
8.3.8	Actual effects of combined fouling on FO performance.....	8-25
8.4	Concluding remarks	8-30
Chapter 9		9-1
PHYSICAL AND CHEMICAL CLEANING OF FOULED HOLLOW FIBER FORWARD OSMOSIS MEMBRANE.....		9-1
9.1	Introduction.....	9-2
9.2	Experimental.....	9-4
9.2.1	FO setup.....	9-4
9.2.2	Membrane used	9-4
9.2.3	Chemicals used.....	9-4
9.2.4	Measurement of water flux.....	9-6
9.2.5	Performance checks.....	9-6
9.3	Results and discussion	9-7
9.3.1	Physical cleaning of FO membrane.....	9-7
9.3.2	Chemical Cleaning	9-10
9.3.3	Chemical cleaning with EDTA cleaning.....	9-15
9.4	Concluding remarks	9-18
Chapter 10		10-1
CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....		10-1
10.1	Introduction.....	10-2
10.2	Conclusions.....	10-3

10.2.1	Flux performances:	10-3
10.2.2	Reverse solute flux Performances	10-5
10.2.3	Use of final diluted DS	10-7
10.2.4	Limited desalination capacity	10-8
10.2.5	Membrane fouling and cleaning	10-9
10.2.6	Concentration polarization:	10-10
10.3	Recommendations and future work.....	10-11

Abstract

Continuous increase in fresh water demand has underscored the importance of developing a low cost water desalination process. Fertilizer drawn forward osmosis (FDFO) presents a promising step forward for low cost desalination using the natural osmotic pressure of the fertilizer draw solution (DS) as a driving force. FDFO carries a distinct advantage over other FO processes because the final diluted draw solution requires minimal to no treatment processes and it can be easily used for any useful fertigation application. This helps to eliminate the energy intensive permeate recovery step for the FO process and represents an economical desalination option. However, the performance ratio outcome for the earlier FO studies has highlighted a number of areas that can be improved in relation to FO performance.

This study evaluated FDFO using eight commercial fertilizers as DS for the flat sheet FO membrane using sea water (SW) quality feed (35 g/L NaCl) and targeting the NPK fertilizer and water requirements for tomato crops. Diverse results were achieved as some of the fertilizers showed significant flux while others showed negative or very low flux outcomes. This indicated that all commercial fertilizers may not be effectively used as DS for the SW quality feed. The results with various quality feed solutions (FS) and DS concentrations indicated that the flux performance does not vary in a linear sense with the changes in $\Delta\pi$. Varying flux outcome for various individual or mixed fertilizer DS's carrying similar $\Delta\pi$ values reflects the involvement of some unknown interactions between the DS and membrane surfaces, both at the active layer (AL) and the support layer (SL), for these specific results. These results further highlighted the fact that the osmotic pressure of the DS alone may not be used as the main criteria for the DS selection but rather the association between the DS

solutes and the active and support layers of the membrane are also vital in terms of understanding the FO flux performances.

In addition, these outcomes revealed a number of limitations in relation to the FDFO e.g. reverse solute flux issues, higher nutrients concentration in the final DS and low recovery for osmotic equilibrium issues.

These fertilizer DS's were further assessed and their performance was compared for cellulose triacetate (CTA) flatsheet and polyamide (PA) hollow fiber FO (HFFO) membranes to understand the association between the DS properties and the membrane characteristics for the FO outcome. It was observed that at similar operating parameters, the PA hollow fiber showed a comparatively better outcome in terms of flux and reverse solute flux (RSF). HFFO was also evaluated for the effects of various operating conditions and markedly enhanced performances were found. It was observed that for 2 M NaCl as DS and DI water as FS, the HFFO successfully delivered water flux of 62.9 LMH at DS/FS Reynolds number (Re) of 3750/1500 whereas the same membrane in AL-FS orientation showed a flux of 9.67 LMH at DS/FS Re of 200/500. This indicated a flux increase of about 511% for a set of two operating conditions for the same FO membrane which further suggested that the changes in the operating conditions induce some indistinct changes in the membrane structure that can affect the water transport phenomenon through the membrane. It is therefore recommended that further studies be undertaken to investigate the real mechanism for the water transport through the membrane as this could contribute to the development of a higher performing membrane for the FO process. Results also indicate that cationic and anionic parts of the DS seriously affect the RSF outcomes. Further evaluation in this regard may contribute towards the creation of a better DS for the FO process with reduced RSF consequences.

The HFFO membrane was further evaluated for inorganic scaling and organic fouling issues using brackish ground water quality FS loaded with various model organic foulants such as humic acid, alginate and bovine serum albumine (BSA). During these FO fouling studies, it was noted that the commonly used FO fouling protocol which is similar to the RO fouling protocol may not be successfully used to evaluate FO fouling. The RO fouling was evaluated against a fixed driving force (hydraulic pressure) and any changes in the flux performance were referred to the fouling impact. However, in FO, as the driving force (net osmotic pressure difference between the FS and DS) kept changing constantly, it was really difficult to predict any flux change which was particularly associated with the scaling or fouling. For any two tests, at any particular time, the FO did not show the same driving force and hence for the evaluation of the fouling, the flux comparison for two different curves was not always useful. Accordingly, a new protocol is suggested for the FO fouling studies.

The fouling results indicated that FO, like the RO membrane, also posed potential operational risks in terms of scaling and fouling. The HFFO membrane indicated varying degrees of fouling potential for the membrane used in the AL-FS and AL-DS orientation and these were not related to membrane properties. Instead the hydrodynamic conditions employed for the process affected the fouling potential of the membranes used. Results indicated that the higher crossflow rate helped to keep the membrane clean from inorganic scale and the turbulence shear force did not allow scale build-up at the high Re.

It was also observed that the inorganic scaling was not fully reversed for the HFFO membrane used in the AL-FS and AL-DS orientations which employed hydraulic cleaning practices because the cleaning totally depended on how the flow shear forces using various cross flowrates were applied on the membrane surface. For the organic foulants, the turbulence shear force could not overcome the membrane–foulant interactions and foulants

layer deposited on the membrane surfaces and reduce the FO performance which was not recovered by hydraulic flushing. The chemical cleaning which used HCl, NaOH and EDTA was evaluated and it was found that the EDTA (pH 11) showed a better outcome for FO membrane cleaning.

Keywords: Fertilizer drawn forward osmosis, draw solute, desalination, sea water, hollow fiber FO membrane, EDTA cleaning.

Journal Articles Published

- 1) **T. Majeed**, S. Sahebi, F. Lotfi, J.E. Kim, S. Phuntsho, L.D. Tijing and H.K. Shon, (2014) *Fertilizer-drawn forward osmosis for irrigation of tomatoes*, Desalination and Water Treatment, 1-14.
- 2) **T. Majeed**, F. Lotfi, S. Phuntsho, J.K Yoon, K. Kim,& H.K. Shon, (2013). *Performances of PA hollow fiber membrane with the CTA flat sheet membrane for forward osmosis process*. Desalination and Water Treatment, 1-11.
- 3) **T. Majeed**, S. Phuntsho, S. Sahebi, J.E. Kim, J.K. Yoon, K. Kim,& H.K. Shon,, (2014). *Influence of the process parameters on hollow fiber-forward osmosis membrane performances*. Desalination and Water Treatment, 1-12.
- 4) S. Phuntsho,, S. Sahebi, **T. Majeed**, F. Lotfi, J.E. Kim, & H.K. Shon, (2013). *Assessing the major factors affecting the performances of forward osmosis and its implications on the desalination process*. Chemical Engineering Journal, 231, 484-496.
- 5) S. Phuntsho, H.K. Shon, **T. Majeed**, I. El Saliby, S. Vigneswaran, J. Kandasamy, S. Hong, & S. Lee, (2012). *Blended fertilizers as draw solutions for fertilizer-drawn forward osmosis desalination*. Environmental Science & Technology, 46, 4567-4575.
- 6) **T. Majeed**, A. Rafiq, M. Yaseen, M. Y. Malik, M. Q. Shahbaz and M. S. A. Taj, (2011). *Some comments on HE's homotopy- perturbation method for solving higher-order boundary value problems*. Nonlinear Analysis Forum 16, 137–146.

Conference papers and presentations

1. **Tahir Majeed** , Sherub Phuntsho, Ho Kyong Shon; *Evaluation of the scaling and fouling potential with appropriate cleaning strategies for hollow fiber forward osmosis membrane*, Civil and Environmental Engineering Research Seminar (CEERS) April 4, 2014, UTS, Sydney.
2. **Tahir Majeed**, Sherub Phuntsho, Ho Kyong Shon; *Hollow fiber forward osmosis desalination using fertilizers as draw solutes*, 8th International Membrane Science and Technology Conference (IMSTEC 2013), 25-29 November 2013, Melbourne, Australia
3. **Fezeh Lotfi**, Tahir Majeed, Sherub Phuntsho, Ho Kyong Shon; *Membrane fouling during fertilizer drawn forward osmosis desalination*, 8th International Membrane Science and Technology Conference (IMSTEC 2013), 25-29 November 2013, Melbourne, Australia
4. **Tahir Majeed**, Sherub Phuntsho, HoKyong Shon, *Performances of the CTA flat sheet and PA hollow fiber forward osmosis forward osmosis membranes: using fertilizers as draw solutes*, Civil and Environmental Engineering Research Seminar (CEERS), August 16, 2013, UTS, Sydney.
5. **Tahir Majeed**, Sherub Phuntsho and Ho Kyong Shon, *Innovative Hollow Fiber Forward Osmosis Desalination for Fertigation*, FEIT Showcase 2013, June 12, 2013, Faculty of Engineering & Information Technology, University of Technology Sydney (UTS), Sydney, Australia.
6. **Tahir Majeed**, Sherub Phuntsho, Ho Kyong Shon, *Fertilizer draw forward osmosis (FDFO) desalination for fertigation: Application to Tomato*, The 5th annual conference on the challenges in environmental science and engineering (CESE) Conference, 9 - 13 September 2012, Melbourne, Australia

7. **Tahir Majeed**, Sherub Phuntsho, HoKyong Shon, A low-energy fertiliser drawn forward osmosis desalination- Possible application for Tomato, Civil and Environmental Engineering Research Seminar (CEERS), August 24, 2012, UTS, Sydney.
8. **Tahir Majeed**, Sherub Phuntsho and HoKyong Shon; Novel Fertilizer draw forward osmosis (FDFO) desalination for fertigation: Application to Tomato, FEIT Showcase 2012, 13 June 2012, School of Civil & Environmental Engineering, Faculty of Engineering & Information Technology University of Technology Sydney (UTS), Sydney, Australia.
9. **Tahir Majeed**, Sherub Phuntsho, Ibrahim El Saliby, Ganesh Sharma, HoKyong Shon, *Mixed fertilizers as draw solutes for the fertilizer drawn forward osmosis desalination*, Civil and Environmental Engineering Research Seminar (CEERS), 28 October 2011, UTS, Sydney.
10. **Tahir Majeed**, Sherub Phuntsho, HoKyong Shon, Ibrahim El Saliby; *Blended Fertilizers as Draw Solution for the Fertilizer Drawn Forward Osmosis Desalination*, 6th IWA Specialist Conference on Membrane Technology for Water and Wastewater Treatment, 4-7 October, 2011, Aachen, Germany
11. HoKyong Shon, **Tahir Majeed**, *Use of Desalination Technologies for Inland Saline Groundwater Treatment –Murray Darling Basin in Australia*, A paper presented at The 4th annual conference on the challenges in environmental science and engineering (CESE) , 25 - 30 September 2011, Tainan City, Taiwan
12. HoKyong Shon, Mohammad Shahid, **Tahir Majeed**, A. P. Salim and J.H . Kim (2011). *Magnetised Titanium dioxide (TiO₂) for Water Purification: Preparation, characterisation and application. Paper presented at The Fourth Annual conference on the Challenges in Environmental Science & Engineering*, Tainan City, Taiwan

13. Sherub Phuntsho, Hokyong Shon and **Tahir Majeed**, (2011). *Performance of Commercial bulk Fertilizer as Draw Solution for forward Osmosis Desalination. Paper presented at The Fourth Annual Conference on the Chanllenges in Environmental Science & Engineering*, Tainan City, Taiwan

Nomenclature

TDS	:	Total dissolved solids
MF	:	Microfiltration
UF	:	Ultrafiltration
NF	:	Nanofiltration
RO	:	Reverse osmosis
FO	:	Forward osmosis
FS	:	Feed solution
DS	:	Draw solution
AL	:	Active layer
SL	:	Support layer
MBR	:	Membrane biological reactor
FDFO	:	Fertilizer drawn forward osmosis
CP	:	Concentration polarization
ECP	:	External concentration polarization
ICP	:	Internal concentration polarization
PR	:	Performance ratio
RSF	:	Reverse solute flux
AL-DS	:	Active layer – draw solution
AL-FS	:	Active layer - feed solution
DI	:	Deionized
MED	:	Multi-effect distillation
MSF	:	Multi-stage flash distillation
VCD	:	Vapor compression distillation
MD	:	Membrane distillation
CDI	:	Capacitive deionization
BWRO	:	Brackish water reverse osmosis
ED	:	Electrodialysis
EDR	:	Electro dialysis reversal
PRO	:	Pressure-retarded osmosis
PBI	:	Polybenzimidazole
PSf	:	Polysulfone
PES	:	Polyethersulfone
PA	:	Polyamide
CA	:	Cellulose acetate
CTA	:	Cellulose triacetate
TFC	:	Thin flim composite
IP	:	Interfacial polymerization
CPSFs	:	Carboxylated polysulfones
PSF	:	Polysulphone
TFN	:	Thin film nanocomposite
PAI	:	Poly (amide-imide)

OMBR	:	Osmotic membrane bioreactor
HF	:	Hollow fiber
FSFO	:	Flat sheet forward osmosis
HFFO	:	Hollow fiber forward osmosis
PAO	:	Pressure assisted osmosis
EPS	:	Extracellular polymeric substances
BW	:	Brackish water
SW	:	Sea water
BGW	:	Brackish ground water
SIS	:	Salt interception scheme
MDB	:	Murray Darling Basin
MFDS	:	Mixed fertilizer draw solutions
NPK	:	Nitrogen; phosphorous; potassium
MAP	:	Mono ammonium phosphate
DAP	:	Di ammonium phosphate
SOA	:	Sulphate of Ammonia
CAN	:	Calcium nitrate
AN	:	Ammonium nitrate
AC	:	Ammonium chloride
BSA	:	Bovine serum albumin
HA	:	Humic acid
NOC	:	Natural organic carbon
EDTA	:	Ethylene di amine tetra acetic acid
SEM	:	Scanning electron microscope
FDDS	:	Final diluted draw solutions
LMH	:	L/m ² /h
AN	:	Ammonium nitrate
AC	:	Ammonium chloride
PWP	:	Pure water permeability
SRSF	:	Specific reverse solute flux
Re	:	Reynolds number
HTI	:	Hydration Technology Innovations

List of Symbols

A	:	Water permeability coefficient ($\text{L} \cdot \text{m}^{-2} \cdot \text{h}^{-1} \cdot \text{bar}^{-1}$)
B	:	Salt permeability coefficient ($\text{m} \cdot \text{s}^{-1}$)
C	:	Solute number density (L^{-1})
c	:	Solute concentration
D/Ds	:	Diffusion coefficient ($\text{m}^2 \text{ s}^{-1}$)
Dh	:	Hydraulic diameter (m)
I	:	Intrinsic membrane structural properties
J _s	:	Solute flux ($\text{g} \cdot \text{m}^{-2} \cdot \text{h}^{-1}$)
J _w	:	Water flux ($\text{L} \cdot \text{m}^{-2} \cdot \text{h}^{-1}$)
J _{w, sp}	:	Specific water flux ($\text{L} \cdot \text{m}^{-2} \cdot \text{h}^{-1} \cdot \text{bar}^{-1}$)
k	:	Mass transfer coefficient
K	:	Solute diffusion resistance ($\text{s} \cdot \text{m}^{-1}$)
K	:	Boltzmann's constant ($1.38 \times 10^{-3} \text{ J} \cdot \text{K}^{-1}$)
M	:	Solute molar concentration ($\text{mol} \cdot \text{L}^{-1}$)
M	:	Molar concentration of the solution
Mw	:	Molecular weight ($\text{mol} \cdot \text{g}^{-1}$)
N	:	Moles of solute (mol)
N _A	:	Avogadro's number
n	:	Van't Hoff factor
P	:	Applied hydraulic pressure (bar)
R/R _g	:	Gas constant ($0.08314 \text{ L} \cdot \text{bar} \cdot \text{mol}^{-1} \cdot \text{K}^{-1}$)
Re	:	Reynolds number
Sc	:	Schmidt number
Sh	:	Sherwood number
T	:	Absolute temperature (in K)
t	:	Thickness of the membrane (m)
Δt	:	Time interval (h)
ΔV	:	Volume change (L)
ΔP	:	Pressure change (bar)

Superscripts/subscripts

w	:	Water
s	:	Solute
F	:	Feed
D	:	Draw
m	:	Membrane
i	:	Interface
D, b	:	Draw, bulk
F, b	:	Feed, bulk
F, m	:	Feed, membrane
D, m	:	Draw, membrane
W, sp	:	Water, specific

Greek letters

π	:	Osmotic pressure (bar)
ϕ	:	Osmotic pressure coefficient
σ	:	Reflection coefficient,
ε	:	Porosity
β	:	van't Hoff coefficient
τ	:	Tortuosity

List of Figures

Fig. 2.1 World water usage trends	2-4
Fig. 2.2. Expected growth of desalination capacities around the world	2-6
Fig. 2.3 Comparison of the operating cost components for thermal (MSF) and membrane (RO) technologies	2-12
Fig. 2.4 Relative water production cost of various competing technologies for different feed water TDS quality	2-14
Fig. 2.5 Installed desalination capacities for various feed water sources	2-14
Fig. 2.6. Driving forces for RO and FO desalination	2-27
Fig. 2.7. Comparison of the separation processes for the existing conventional membrane processes and FO process	2-28
Fig. 2.8 Water and solute molecules movements for RO and FO	2-29
Fig. 2.9 Revolutionary ammonia and carbon dioxide FO process requires more steps in permeate recovery	2-30
Fig. 2.10 Applications of FO in the fields of water, energy and life science	2-32
Figure 2.11. SEM images of different FO membranes a) active surface of HTI FO membrane b) TFC PA active layer c) PAI hollow fiber substrate d) RO like inner skin for double skinned hollow fiber e) cross-section of hollow fiber FO membrane f) cross-section of HTI CA membrane g) Sponge middle layer h) HTI support layer	2-50
Fig. 2.12 Draw solutions used in FO based on approximately 50% of FO publications. Results are expected to increase in similar ratios when considering all published studies.	2-51
Fig 2.13: Permeate recovery from dilute DS in $\text{NH}_3\text{-CO}_2$ FO process	2-57
Fig. 2.14: Fertilizer drawn forward osmosis system requires no regeneration of the draw solution	2-58

Fig. 2.15 Effect of the mean osmotic pressure ratio upon the energy penalty imposed by draw solution dilution. The theoretical energy penalty is the difference between the theoretical energy required for direct desalination and the theoretical energy for draw regeneration.	2-61
Fig. 2.16 Graphic presentation of external concentration polarization (ECP) and internal concentration polarization (ICP) for AL-FS and AL-DS membrane orientation ...	2-67
Figure 2.17 Organic and biofouling on the active layer of the FO membrane a) fouling of humic acid; b) fouling of biopolymers and c) adhered bacteria	2-71
Fig. 3.1. RO system used to evaluate pure water permeability and salt rejection for FO membranes	3-9
Fig. 3.2: The schematic diagram of the laboratory-scale FO system	3-10
Fig. 3.3. FO orientation in AL-FS and AL-DS a) Flat sheet membrane cell b) Hollow fibre membrane module	3-14
Fig. 3.4. Reference curves used to evaluate RSF for a) NaCl and b) KCl	3-15
Fig. 3.5. a) Scanning electron microscope (Zeiss Supra 55 VP) b) Contact angle measurement system	3-16
Fig. 4.1. Experimental set-up for FDFO study for tomato	4-7
Fig. 4.2 Impurities observed during DS preparation from various commercial fertilizers a) NH_4Cl b) MAP and c) KCl	4-10
Fig. 4.3. Various important factors effecting the FDFO process design and outcome for particular crops	4-15
Fig. 4.4. Pure water flux using selected single fertilizers DS with varying molar concentrations. BW35 was used as FS.	4-17
Fig 4.5 Comparison of the flux and osmotic pressure (π) trends for urea DS (up to 6 M concentration) and NH_4Cl and KCl DS (1 M concentration)	4-18

Fig 4.6. Flux (LMH) and net osmotic pressure $\Delta\pi$ (atm) trends for various fertilizer DS (1M concentration) with a) DI water FS b) BW35 sea water quality FS	17	4-19
Fig 4.7. Flux outcome for unit $\Delta\pi$ applied for varying fertilizer DS. Fertilizers were used in 1 M concentration as DS for DI water and BW35 quality FS	17	4-21
Fig. 4.8. RSF (in $\text{g/m}^2/\text{hr}$) for various single DS fertilizers used in the study a) nitrogen source fertilizers as NH_4Cl , NH_4NO_3 and SOA b) phosphate fertilizers as DAP and MAP and c) potassium fertilizers as KCl and KNO_3		4-23
Fig. 5.1. Osmotic pressure and resultant flux changing trends for different DS prepared for various tomato crop growth stages a) S1 stage with NH_4NO_3 as N-source fertilizer b) S2 stage using NH_4Cl as N-source c) S2, urea replaced NH_4Cl N-source in DS, d) and e) S3 stage with NH_4Cl and urea replaced NH_4Cl N-fertilizer source in DS and f) S4 stage DS using urea and NH_4Cl as N-source fertilizers. (AN: Ammonium nitrate, AC: Ammonium chloride and U: Urea represents main N-source fertilizer in respective DS).		5-11
Fig. 5.2. Effect of osmotic pressure and net osmotic pressure on FO flux outcome for various DS mixtures		5-12
Fig. 5.3. Comparison of a) Flux and $\Delta\pi/J_w$ (bars/LMH) b) Net osmotic pressure gradient $\Delta\pi$ (bars) and $J_w(\text{LMH})/\Delta\pi(\text{bars})$ for different mixed fertilizer DS		5-14
Fig. 5.4. Water flux with varying N-source component in mixed fertilizer DS: NH_4Cl N-source based DS shows the highest flux whereas Urea and NH_4NO_3 based DS gives lower but nearly the same flux (DS were prepared for 1(25%), 2(33%) and 3(50%) concentrations of Stage S1 NPK fertilizer requirements).		5-15
Fig. 5.5. Nitrogen (N), Phosphorous (P) and Potassium (K) RSF behaviour for DS in the FDFO process. All these RSF values are taken as GMH ($\text{g/m}^2/\text{h}$). P- RSF shows values for the first two stages S1 and S2 as phosphate fertilizer but it was not used to prepare DS for the S3 and S4 stages.		5-18
Fig. 5.6. N, P and K RSF for various DS used. a) Flux (LMH) plotted along with RSF for N, P and K b) Net osmotic pressure ($\Delta\pi$) plotted along with RSF for N, P and K.		

Along the horizontal axis, the first two letters in the brackets indicate the nitrogen source used to prepare the DS for that particular stage. Similarly numbers 1, 2 and 3 indicate the specific concentrations of particular DS. 5-20

Fig. 5.7. Long run FDFO flux trends for three DS prepared to meet the S2 and S4 stage NPK requirement. Stage S2 DS used NH_4Cl N-source. Two S4 DS were used with different N-source fertilizers. One used NH_4Cl and the other used urea as a nitrogen source fertilizer to prepare DS mixtures. 5-22

Fig. 5. 8. FDFO approach for sea water desalination for tomato fertigation 5-25

Fig. 6.1. Schematics of lab scale HFFO set-up used in this study6-7

Fig 6.2. SEM images for both FO membranes used in our study. a) cross-section of HF FO membrane showing the inside active PA layer supported by outside PES layer b) FSFO membrane, with CTA active dense layer embedded on polyester mesh c) HFFO horizontally cut, larger view, d) FSFO active layer (top view) e & f) HFFO cross-section 6-11

Fig. 6.4. RSF with HFFO and FSFO membranes for fertilizer DS 6-15

Fig. 7.1. HFFO membrane (in AL-FS orientation) module showing the DS and FS flow directions under the co-current and counter current arrangement for FO experiments
..... 7-6

Fig. 7.2. FO performance in terms of water flux under different crossflow directions. Other operating conditions include AL-FS membrane orientation, DS: 2M NaCl, FS: DI, Re for DS: 1300, Re for FS: 500 7-8

Fig. 7.3. Effect of draw solution concentration and membrane orientation on flux outcome, DI water is used as FS whereas for varying experiments, DS was used in 1-3M NaCl, DS and FS showed Re (AL-FS) of 1300 and 500 and for Re (AL-DS) of 500 and 1300 respectively. 7-10

Fig. 7.4. a) Effect of membrane orientation on FS conductivity rise b) Effect of membrane orientation of RSF, DS : 1M NaCl and FS :DI water, 7-12

Fig. 7.5. Comparison of the SRSF outcome (present work with the literature data) ...
..... 7-13

Fig. 7.6. FO performances using three DS carrying same anionic part (Cl^-). a) Flux b) RSF. NaCl, NH_4Cl and KCl DS were used in 1M concentration, DI water was used as feed.	7-14
Fig. 7.7. Effect of changing DS/FS crossflow rate on HFFO membrane water flux. a) AL-FS orientation, and b) AL-DS orientation, 1M , 3M and 5M NaCl DS were evaluated DI water FS. Fraction in legends shows Re for DS and FS respectively. For legends, the first term of the fraction represents Re for DS and other Re for FS ...	7-18.
Fig. 7.8. Effect of changing crossflow rate of only one stream (either DS or FS) on FO flux. These tests were performed at AL-DS membrane orientation. 1M and 3M NaCl DS were used with DI water FS.	7-19
Fig. 7.9. Effect of changing DS and FS flow rates on FO flux performance with a) 1M NaCl DS b) 3M NaCl DS, DI water was used as feed. Flux was evaluated at AL-DS membrane orientation.	7-20
Fig. 7.10. SEM images of polyamide membrane active layer- showing irregular shape membrane structure pores	7-21
Fig. 7.11. Flux outcome showing effect of operating conditions for the same membrane. Condition Set # 1 (AL-FS orientation, DS Re 200, FS Re 500), Condition set # 2 (AL-DS orientation, DS Re 3750, FS Re 1500), DS: 2M NaCL and FS: DI water.	7-23
Fig. 8.1. Theme of the study showing that for fouling experiments the overall scenario for FO process is not similar to UF/MF/RO/NF processes. Hence the existing fouling experimental protocol may not be used to evaluate fouling effects for the FO membrane.	8-4
Fig. 8.2. Sequence of operations performed at two side by side FO units (set-up # 1 and set-up # 2) to evaluate the effects of scaling and fouling on the HFFO membrane...	8-6
Fig. 8.3. Effect of changing FS (for inorganic fouling) and DS concentration on HFFO flux a) in AL-FS b) in AL-DS c) effect of FS concentration on FO flux for AL-FS d) for AL-DS membrane. 2 M KCl Ds was used. DI water, BGW10, BGW20 and BGW35 were used as FS.	8-14

Fig. 8.4. Effect of model organic foulants on flux performance of FO process a) with DI water FS in A-FS b) with 35 g/L BGW FS in AL-FS c) with DI FS in AL-DS and d) with BGW35 in AL-DS orientation. 2 M KCl was used as DS for both AL-FS and AL-FS orientation, crossflow Re DS- 700, FS-1900 and temperature was $25 \pm 0.5^{\circ}\text{C}$..	8-17
Fig. 8.5. Showing the effects of fouling layer on the ICP and ECP for FO operations a) at AL-FS and b) at AL-DS. Fouling layer has higher effects on ECP in AL-FS than ICP in AL-DS orientation	8-20
Fig. 8.6. Effect of membrane orientation and FS concentration on FO flux, Conditions: DS: 2 M KCl, FS: DI and BGW35 carrying Alginate, HA and BSA were used in 60 mg/L concentration each, temperature : $25 \pm 0.5^{\circ}\text{C}$, membrane orientation: evaluated for both AL-FS and AL-DS	8-22
Fig. 8.7. Showing effect of scaling on HFFO membrane performance a) for AL-FS and AL-DS membrane orientation with 2 M NaCl DS and BGW10, BGW20 and BGW35 as FS b) flux performance for step-1 and step-5, 2 M KCl was used as DS against DI water and BGW35 FS, evaluated for both AL-FS and AL-DS membrane orientation, Temp: $25 \pm 0.5^{\circ}\text{C}$	8-26
Fig. 8.8. Graphical presentation of the effect of crossflow shear force within and outside the HFFO lumens. The shear force effect with the varying crossflow rate affects the results of the hydraulic cleaning of HFFO membrane.	8-27
Fig. 8.9. Showing the effect of the combined organic fouling on the performance of the HFFO membrane a) flux in AL-FS membrane orientation b) flux in AL-DS membrane orientation	8-31
Fig. 9.1. Different physical and chemical membrane cleaning procedures used for this study	9-5
Fig. 9.2. Effect of physical cleaning of HFFO membrane for AL-FS and AL-DS orientation. 2 M KCl DS and 60 mg/L each of HA and BSA were used with BGW35 quality FS for the fouling test. Normal flushing was carried out at crossflow rates representing Re of 1900 and 700 whereas fast hydraulic flux used higher crossflow Re. of 2350 and 1450 for lumen side and shell side respectively	9-11

Fig. 9.3. Performances of various combinations of chemicals (HCl and NaOH) for HFFO membrane cleaning. Membrane was used for fouling experiments in AL-DS orientation	9-13
Fig. 9.4. Performances of FO membrane with cleaning a) resultant flux at AL-FS orientation b) flux at AL-DS orientation. Red circle shows the baseline flux	9-15
Fig. 9.5. Comparison of effects of different chemicals in FO membrane cleaning performance a) Chemical cleaning using NaOH (pH 11) and b) Chemical cleaning using 1 mM EDTA (pH 11)	9-17

List of Tables

Table 2.1. Broad classification of desalination technologies	2-6
Table 2.2 Overview of main desalination technologies	2-8
Table 2.3. Selection criteria of the major desalination technologies for feed water. Also indicates the treated water quality outcome	2-10
Table 2.4. Effect of feed water source on energy (electrical/thermal) used by various desalination technologies	2-13
Table. 2.5. Major FO applications	2-33
Table 2.6. Advances in forward osmosis membrane developments	2-45
Table 2.7. Summary of the major draw solutes used and their major drawbacks	2-54
Table 2.8 Various configurations for modules used for FO desalination	2-62
Table 2.9 Various hybrid technologies that used the FO process to separate desalinated water from DS	2-63
Table 3.1. Tap water analysis - Adapted from Sydney Water	3-3
Table 3.2: Detailed composition of various synthetic BGW qualities evaluated for the FO fouling study. Osmotic pressure is calculated using OLI Stream Analyzer 3.2 software	3-4
Table: 3.3 Chemical analysis of different commercial fertilizers used as DS in this study	3-5
Table 3.4 Selected fertilizers used to prepare mixed fertilizer DS, showing their nitrogen/ phosphorous/ potassium (NPK) nutrient composition and the osmotic pressure that these fertilizers exert at 1M concentrations	3-6
Table. 3.5 Details of the FO membrane used in this study	3-8
Table 4.1 Effects of water availability on agricultural production, tomato harvesting area and production (World/Australia)	4-2

Table: 4.2. Summary of the operating conditions for the bench scale FO process used for the tomato crop	4-9
Table 4.3. Nutrients requirements of the open field tomato according to its physical stages. These fertilizer requirements were used to prepare various forms of DS to meet the varying nutrient requirements for any given growth stage	4-10
Table 4.4. Shortlisted fertilizers showing their NPK nutrient composition were used to prepare the single fertilizer DS for the FDFO process	4-13
Table 6.1. Summary of the operating conditions for bench scale HFFO and FSFO	
Table 6.1 Summary of the operating conditions for the batch scale HFFO and FSFO membrane systems for the FDFO process comparative study	6-8
Table 6.2. Comparison of FSFO and HFFO membrane characteristics and physical properties	6-9
Table 8.1: Detailed composition of various synthetic BGW qualities evaluated for the FO fouling study. Osmotic pressure is calculated using OLI Stream Analyzer 3.2 software	8-8